

Ancient World: I've noticed material on Sumer appearing, and Babylon and Egypt, somewhat along the lines of J H Breasted of Chicago, first published in 1916. And protests against their suppression in American 'World Histories' controlled by Jews. Wars, notably in Iraq, have contributed to this small interest. Jews suppress their histories, stories, myths, and legends, probably because Jews don't like to admit their writings are parasitical. Small note: the idea that the Mediterranean Sea was formed by a deluge through Africa/Spain seems undiscussed.

Ancient World Despite the Renaissance, the rediscoveries of Tacitus and Thucydides, the writings of Gibbon, and Grote on Greece; British education has been starved with centuries of very thin gruel, lightweight discussions on Sparta and mercenaries, Alexander 'the Great'; corresponding more or less to the lightweight material on religion. Hugh Trevor-Roper (=Lord Dacre) thought that reading Julius Caesar was perfect training for 19th-century schoolboys. In the 1940s, Alfred Whitehead praised tolerance, exactly at the time the Judeo-British Empire was collapsing. The childish discussion of 'battle' and 'war' without examination of the causes and effects will I hope be replaced by something more intelligent, and of course is part of the motivation for my writings.

Ancient World Barnes Review 2009, #5 has some material on Greece, both ancient and modern. [Including Greece, Persia, Macedonia, Athens, and Sparta; and the Ottoman Empire, including the Armenian Christian genocide (1912-1913); and Holocaust Revisionism; and 'Golden Dawn'. Genetic studies on Greece (notably to what extent modern Greeks resemble ancient Greeks) must in my view be in their infancy. I select that publication to exemplify the slow spread of revisionist ideas back in time.]

c. 300 BC Book of Exodus Andrew Joyce Jan 7 & Apr 8th 2017: '... [is] an effort at refuting a Greek and Egyptian consensus on the undesirable behaviors of the Jewish populations in their midst. ... was, and remains, crucial in providing a foundation myth for Jewish victimhood narratives and thus a foundation for the Jewish hoax.'

It may be that Exodus provided practice for subsequent group lying by 'Jews'. Remember the Roman Empire at the eastern Mediterranean did not penetrate far inland, only reaching to mountains and trees. The Phoenician shore (north of 'Jews') was a route linking the sea to the east. Bear in mind the size of the Med—ten times all the U.S. Great Lakes put together. Sidon and Tyre were close to Jews, and had connection with the networks of sea-routes.

An obvious problem with lies is that, if the catchment areas grew, different lies might flourish locally, only to be caught out later. A modern illustration is the Jewish nuclear hoax; if 'Jews' in Israel rely on a supposed nuclear defense, they might be unhappy when it's exposed. By the 21st centuries, there are so many Judaic frauds, such as the Fed, the holohoax, 9/11, anti-Germanism, and anti-white movements, that there may be sudden multiple collapses. Let's hope so.

Those examples are intra-'Jew'. But there are conflicts between 'Jew' and Jew-defined groups of non-Jews. An obvious example is the 'Chosen People' meme, which is generally kept secret from those described by Jews as 'goyim'. One problem is that it is obviously not true, and, if it were true, Jews should not need special treatment.

And there are possible disputes not only within 'Jews', but between non-Jews groups. For example, the 'racial purity' fake is clear both to Jews and non-Jews if they find out about groups of Jews which have interbred. The 'maternal descent' idea is obviously contradicted by genetics, as males must be equally Jewish (or non-Jewish) as females, so however much they may want to hide it, genetically they must be equally 'Jewish'.

[Russell E Gmirkin's book demonstrates a heavy literary dependence of Genesis on Berossus's *Babyloniaca* (278 BC) and Exodus on Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* (ca. 285–280 BC), [and] general reliance of Exodus on literary sources ... at Alexandria's Great Library. Manetho reported [we are able to piece together much of its contents based on subsequent rebuttals by later Jewish writers such as Flavius

Josephus, and also references to the text by several Greek and Greek-Egyptian intellectuals] that centuries earlier a foreign population had entered Egypt's eastern border via "infiltration of the Delta." This foreign population subsequently rose in power within Egypt, becoming a burden and a pestilence to the natives. At some point, the foreign population developed a serious disease of the skin, and the Egyptians were finally motivated to expel the invaders, who later relocated to Jerusalem.]

- THE SUBTEXTS OF 'EXODUS'

exodos

The book titled exodos was written in Greek, presumably as it was aimed at non-Jews, and Greek was the leading written language in Europe at that time. Exodus is the Latinised form of the title; and the Latin text has been translated many times into more-or-less modern English, but the title 'Exodus' was retained. The word is composite, meaning something like 'way out' in a neutral sense.

BUT the book carries an unstated assumption, a given, an implied truth. Exodus trusts confidently that the actions of its subject group, whatever they were, do not even merit expulsion, much less anything harsher.

It's astonishing to see this attitude persistent through millennia, stuffed and propped up by organised deceptions. To this day, punishments of so-called 'Jews', if they are considered at all, stop with 'expulsion'. And yet entire genocidal wars have been secretly arranged by Jews. There are a few people today who favour reappropriation or execution, but of course the Jewish media censor them—(for example) Alex Linder.

In effect, a subset of people appears to be genetically or by upbringing unable to recognise other's rights. We are in an undeclared war.

That's the subtext of Exodus: plaintive, pleading, deceptive, and cryptically founded on separation for self-described 'Jews'. To this day the US-based ADL expects killing and blame for non-Jews, and exemption from punishment for Jews, for all activities.

c. 0 - 400 AD Greek Empire eclipsed by Roman. Decline and Fall of Rome. Christianity allowed after Jews Judaised it and supported an inferior Roman Emperor. Jews waned; Islam was a later 'Abrahamic' invention by Jews to exploit Arabs against whites. A few centuries later, the Khazars were converted, or taken over, or genetically changed by the new 'Judaism'; but were positioned to significantly affect the route between Asia and Europe.

c. 400 - 800 AD 'Dark Ages' marked by lack of documentation, evidence, etc. Jewish 'Christianity' infiltrated European countries, trying to impose a connected networks of churches, financed from rents and other impositions, and acting as spies. The process was (and is) kept secret and dark. It must be similar to the present-day subversions by Jews as a world crypto-elite.

- THIS IS A NEW INTERPRETATION - Remember you heard it here first! — though the early Christian part must have been known to the late ancient world

Based on so-called 'Jews' and their behaviour today, it's possible to reconstruct what must have happened to the Roman Empire. How was it replaced by what's called Christianity?

- Probably a parasitic group emerged, after a millennium or two or three of group evolution in Mesopotamian city civilisation, specialising in targeting ruling individuals and small groups, using acting skills and extreme concealment and what many people would regard as psychopathy. It may resemble the present day's 'Jews'—a group of intra-specialists, and a herd who were expected to follow, and almost always did so, including commands to steal and defraud and kill and rape.

- In about what's now labelled 0 A.D., the Roman Empire had loosely corralled, moved, joined, or otherwise made aware, human and language groups from Spain to Palestine and Slav countries, and from mid-to-north Europe to the Mediterranean and north Africa. It must have been obvious to anyone that new outlooks might change things.

- Early Christians must have been composed of many groups and many influences, including Persian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, Latin and northern mythologies, technological influences such as ships, buildings and food, legal systems, and, importantly, the written word. Papyrus seems to have become cheap and was obviously more portable than stone and baked clay tablets.

- Opinions of early Christians (or 'primitive Christians') are mysterious; they have been censored. But the general view seems to be that they felt enlightened, shining, warm, lighted, golden—the word Christ being Greek, connected with gold. The chi-rho symbol of a fish (from the Greek word), and the use of catacombs in Rome, suggests an empire-wide fusion. They may of course never have amounted to much. But their beliefs would have been nothing like Judaic beliefs.

- Traditionally, unrealistic people consider religions to be other-worldly. But it must have been obvious that organisation was necessary, and probably there was competition for bureaucrats wanting settled careers, with speakers and broadcasters, a common language, with reading and writing for messages and accounting, and buildings. Probably Jews saw the opportunity to exploit in the guise of helping. Think of the development of tithes, for example, where the church in effect gets 10% of the net agricultural product.

- Any group which extended over other groups would presumably benefit from a common language, which would be likely to be incomprehensible to most of the members of the groups, tribes, nations. A lingua franca in fact, though Napoleon never quite managed to spread French across the world. Examples include Latin, Greek, Arabic, Russian, and literati Chinese (China was comparable to Europe in size, with as many accents, and mutually-incomprehensible languages). Hebrew, Yiddish (or whatever) was comparable in the sense of being spread among varied countries, but different in being alien and not indigenous, needing secrecy to hide their outlandish nature.

Fairly modern map; the Aral Sea was once larger. Showing likely areas of religious takeovers by Jews. Very roughly (places & names change):

UA=Ukraine, AM=Armenia. R=Rome. C=Constantinople. J=Jerusalem. M=Medina.

Arabs occupied a large area, and were well positioned to take over the remains of the Roman Empire, much of it around the Mediterranean Sea. Note: a silk route between Europe and China went north of the Khazar enclave, marked K. The Khazars had mountain and water barriers to the south, and were well-positioned to act with (or against) Silk Route merchants—and Huns, and Mongols, and the Chinese. And the Kaifeng Jews, visually indistinguishable from Chinese.

- About four centuries passed before Christianity became a state religion. This movement must have been taken over by Jews; the process has been analogous in modern Europe, and what became the USA over a similar time period. Essentially, Jews took a chance on inventing a new group which they could secretly run. Probably all the Gospels and Acts were forgeries, designed to implant 'Yeshua' into Christianity, where it did not previously exist. Judging by Jewish techniques now, their documents and preachers and hired followers and thugs would shout down and drown out opposition. Anyone who thinks that this is implausible should examine modern Jewish techniques: the holocaustianity fraud is a good example of persistent, systematic, unremitting blatant lies, believed (because of inherited Jewish instinct) to be undisprovable. Propaganda about Nero is an interesting parallel from the Roman world to propaganda about Hitler now. The 'black legend' about Spain, parallels the vilification of Germany now.

- ‘Christianity’ as invented by Jews must have been shaped by their desires. Having felt the sharp end of Roman power, they would preach self-absorption, other-worldliness, pacifism and 'turning the other cheek', chastity (a white population control method), leaving families, and giving money away.

- Constantine was notorious as an unattractive bastard child with resentments—just the type Jews today prefer as fronts. He may have relied on Jews to support his army.

After Constantine: 'The Roman State ... was almost continually at war until it ceased to exist. The Christian States which succeeded it continued to fight each other, though also ... fought states which were not Christian.' There's a suggestive parallel with the USA today, with endless wars, which Jews use to kill off anyone they think rivals them. Whether they have anywhere to go if the US fails must be something they consider.

- For centuries now, historians and commentators have puzzled over the rise of Christianity: why did nobody try to continue the Roman empire? Why not organise? Why not try to improve matters?—and the parallel with today shows why: Jews are concerned with themselves, and, probably genetically, are programmed to hate rivals. They were not interested in prolonging the system, any more than Jews now want the white world to flourish. A controlled Church suited them. Or at least they moved towards it, with fanatical and imbecilic lack of thought. Jews may have declined, or been killed or thrown out—perhaps a motive for trying the same trick on Arabs, and fleeing to Khazaria.

- Histories since the Middle Ages have attributed the destruction of writings of early Christians to Christians (in the Jew-infected sense) themselves. I'd suggest much of the destruction of documents was a Jewish activity carried out with the concentrated energy of parasites: think of the modern parallels—systematic removal of documents about the First World War, 9/11 destruction of financial records, control of historians over the Holocaust, huge funds to support liars, and systematic standardised lies about foreign wars and foreign criminals. Many Americans at the present day seriously imagine that belief in the mythical 'Christ' figure will stop wars.

- Ever since, there has been tension between local and regional churches, which naturally had some local patriotism, and Jews, lurking in the background, promoting their fake made-up rubbish. For example, the Old Testament was made official in the final assembly of a canon of works, all, absurdly, Jewish. Much of the Middle Ages is a tug of war between lurking Jews, who generally made trouble by fomenting wars, and the more overt Roman and Eastern and Orthodox Churches, who often foolishly took up larger loans than they could possibly afford.

Denunciations of Jews and usury by the Church look likely to be partly fake: the Roman Church continued to use Jewish money, for example for Cathedrals, so probably the denunciations were intended to keep the Jewish monopoly on coinage and credit and usury. The 'they killed Jesus' idea may have been made up to pretend the Church was very anti-Jewish, or to highlight real or supposed differences between Jewish or Christian sects or groups.

[Andrew Joyce, who however does not claim secret mutual support by Jews and Church:— Jews were able to form settlements in Europe only because they were given assistance by the Christian Church in the form of Papal decrees that approved their residence, as well as granting them freedom from efforts at conversion and protection against 'maltreatment'. Without a Christian theology that taught that Jews possessed a special role in the history of humankind, it is unlikely that Jews would have been able to settle in Europe in the manner they eventually did. (Some of the most influential treatises in this regard were formulated by Bernard of Clairvaux and Thomas Aquinas.) Bernard of Clairvaux 1090-1153; Aquinas b c 1225 in Italy, says Wikipedia]

- And this state of affairs still applies. At present, Jews have the upper hand, and have changed many tenets of churches unrecognisably; and of course they had the triumph of massacring millions of Orthodox Russians, equivalent perhaps to massacres in north Africa and Cyprus in about 100 AD. The influence of Jews in Turkey and Arabia and Africa is becoming better-known now, with Internet.

- Paradoxically, there is sense in the phrase 'Judeo-Christian', since Jews arranged the forgery of the New Testament.
- We are, now, accustomed to the separation of Church from State: it seems natural that a church should co-exist with people who aren't official religious believers or performers. But it's possible early Jews wanted to rule; maybe they were not powerful or convincing or impressive enough to impose themselves. Considering how the 'Holocaustianity' fraud is being pushed worldwide, I'd guess the unstated aim was to rule—something to bear in mind. In my opinion this separation was most fortunate, since it allowed some scope for creativity and genius.

Based on so-called 'Jews' and their behaviour today, it's also possible to reconstruct the invention of Islam, as Rome and Christianity finally weakened and failed.

- Inventing Islam. Jews had writing. The technologies for producing ink (brush or pen) on papyrus, and binding the result, were well worked-out. Jews had plenty of stories to draw on, and a crude philosophy. They must have wanted an army of controllable aggressive thugs, to carry out their own orders. Someone, possibly Jews, invented scripts in such languages as Arabic and Georgian.
- Here's an indication of what Jews felt as the remains of the Roman Empire left little for parasites. Jewish academic Dr. David Wasserstein: "Islam saved Jewry. This is an unpopular, discomfoting claim in the modern world. But it is a historical truth. ... First, in 570 AD, when the Prophet Mohammad was born, the Jews and Judaism were on the way to oblivion. And second, the coming of Islam saved them, providing a new context in which they not only survived, but flourished, laying foundations for subsequent Jewish cultural prosperity—also in Christendom—through the medieval period into the modern world."

Wasserstein is saying—not very clearly—that the army of Muslims were thieves controlled by Jews.

- The Quran or Koran may have been composed by Jews, or on their suggestions. The tradition is that the illiterate Mohammed spent time in a cave, and emerged with writings which were God's words, G-d's words, Allah's words, or whatever. Jews regard themselves as God, rather amusingly, so the tradition may well be accurate in that sense—discussing with Mohammed what he wanted, it must have been easy enough to assemble a pastiche of Jewish material aimed at Arabs, and add to it when circumstances changed. Let's look at supporting evidence.
- The Quran is the first Arab writing of any consequence (unless earlier material was lost or destroyed). This alone suggests that literate foreigners compiled it, in language(s) which need no be Arabic. The script may have been a Jew invention: it is right-to-left. The sounds must have been similar. Vowel sounds were not used; some texts are undotted. The Quran does not use Jewish script, presumably what's now called Hebrew, but Jews would not have wanted Arabs to be able to read their 'sacred' psychopathy.
- The whole point of the Quran must have been to hijack beliefs of Arabs and insert Jewish desires and beliefs, to give Jews themselves some immunity. For example, Abraham was inserted. Otherwise, Arabs were to be as violent and vicious and grasping as possible, with Christians a possible exception, depending on Jewish policies at different times. Of course the Talmud provided many handy examples of viciousness. And of course it provided no examples of unparasitic activity.
- Here are some comments on these violent tribal cults (too long to be copied here). Here's what may be the naturally evolved state of Arabs: The Arab was a nomad, not a cultivator, and brought with him ... agricultural disaster. ... The Arab is sometimes called the Son of the Desert, but ... in most cases he is the Father of the Desert, having created it himself, and the arid waste in which he lives and on which practically nothing will grow is the direct result of his appalling indolence, combined with his simian trait of destroying everything he does not understand ... Yet Arabs are withal, the quickest of peoples to follow the call to truth and righteousness. For their natures are relatively simple and free from the distorting effect of bad habits and evil ways ...

• Here's a book review on Islam and 'Liberal Democracies' (i.e. Jew-controlled societies). Too long for inclusion, but note similarities:

[1] 'Jizya' a permanent tax, sounds Jewish, a bit like central bank control;

[2] 'Taqiyya' resembles 'Kol Nidre';

[3] Death penalty for apostasy;

[4] Ritual cruel animal slaughter;

[5] Food taboos;

[6] Circumcision;

[7] Legal system of a sort;

[8] Ritual killing techniques reserved for enemies;

[9] Child sex;

[10] Prostitution, slavery (still carried out);

[11] Taboos against representative art;

[12] Lunar calendar, presumably because of lack of obvious seasons;

[13] Fanaticism liable to be triggered;

[14] 'Allah will provide' mentality is similar to Jewish parasitic outlook; [15] Singing, chanting.

• But there are differences, which are attributable to Jewish skewing:

[1] Judaism relies on a narrow specialised clique, but Islam can be spread by anyone who can read Arabic.

[2] Islam allows conversion, which of course gets the numbers up, whereas Jews generally prohibit conversion. So much so, that today Muslim populations are huge;

[3] Dysgenic things can be expected to have been inserted into Islam, where there are many genetic diseases—though Judaism has these, too;

[4] Jihad is not explicitly present in Judaism, where deep fanatical grudging hate is nursed, and mass murder run by Jews occurs only when conditions are favourable.

[5] Judaism is usually a minority cult;

[6] Judaism celebrates (usually in secret, on encoded) past triumphs, such as murders. As far as I know, Islam is assumed to be more-or-less without planning or memorials, since historical awareness might lead them to quiz Jews.

[6] One of the reasons for permitting polygyny (up to four 'wives') may be the genetics of sickle-cell anemia (or Thalassaemia) which is lethal if the parents are both carriers.

• END OF THIS NEW INTERPRETATION

[Start of 'Real Jewish Studies' | Top of Page: Truths about Judaism]

700 AD very roughly to the present day. Muslims, and the lost Khazar Empire: Note that the combination of a nomadic group, unused to towns, and the opportunities for parasitism, plus the crystallising effect of book-induced inbreeding and hatred of other groups, seem to have combined almost ideally after about 700 AD to produce cults dangerous to all who came into contact with them. The parachuted-in version of 'Judaism' post-dated Islam, though not by much, suggesting that parasitism had become a workable lifestyle preying on static civilisations. Possibly predator-prey relationships will be found, if serious history continues to increase.

'The classic example of power through fanaticism is the rise of Judaism. The Khan added nothing to the material resources of the Khazars, and yet, within a few years, they had acquired a large empire. Undoubtedly, the religion imposed by the Khan was an essential element in the success of this nation. ...' (Modified to illustrate the point from a passage by Bertrand Russell on Islam in his book 'Power').

[An identical story, about a/the Khazar conversion, has been dated to 1000 AD. If interested, see here, below. The 'Abrahamic' religions seem to have had more conversions and alliances than customary history likes.]

Note added June 2014: David Duke and Kevin MacDonald joined forces in opposing the Khazar hypothesis. David Duke quotes Arthur Koestler, a 'Hungarian Jew' and populariser of the Khazar idea, who hoped that if most Eastern European Jews were descended from the Khazars, the racial basis for anti-Semitism would be removed and anti-Semitism itself could disappear. However, Koestler did little original research, but simply quoted from a number of sources, probably authentic, some very early, on the Khazars (who lived between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, north of the Caucasus Mountains—which are taller than the Alps). Other books on the subject include a Russian (I think) precursor, Lev Gumilev, head of an ethnographic institute—though I haven't checked Koestler's book. *Jews, Khazars, DNA and Jews and Muslims: Similar Tribal Cults* look at some of the issues, post-Roman Empire. Kevin MacDonald's work on Jews assumed they were 'Jews' as defined more-or-less Biblically in the USA, and wanted a genetic link, not a discontinuity between two separate groups of 'Jews'. Most 'Jews' seem to have settled down into opposing the Khazar idea, within themselves, by 2014. David Duke claims they promote the Khazar idea for non-Jews (including Michael A Hoffman; his works are all Khazar-based).

This seems a mistake to me. [1] People don't object to Jews because those people are 'anti-Semitic'—itself a crude expression. They object because of behaviour, not the 'racial basis'. Changing the name makes no difference! A Jew by any other name smells the same. [2] A collection of converts may be genetically modified by their influential 'Holy' book(s). [3] There is a controlled experiment here: Islam was influential at roughly the same time, spread widely, and must have had effects promoting inbreeding, fanaticism, and so on in the affected populations. So I see no difficulty with a somewhat isolated tribe, the Khazars, being genetically modified by Talmudic material over a few centuries.

As a thought experiment: if a population were to be suddenly exposed to pornography in large quantities, and were told pornographers were wonderful people worth a lot of money, and pornographers were allowed to expel or kill objectors to pornography, would you expect that population after a few centuries to be well-balanced?

It's possible Duke and MacDonald have a submerged aim in mind: to keep 'Jews' together, and not allow the possibility of their spreading to Europe, or Birobidjan, or Madagascar. With luck, counterattacks like Open Borders for Israel and detailed analysis of Jewish assets will finally weaken them.